UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,461	10/17/2001	Douglas A. Johnson	00,284	5905

7590   07/16/2003

Harley R. Ball Esq.,
Sprint Law Department
8140 Ward Parkway, MOKCMP0506
Kansas City, MO 64114

EXAMINER
TRAN, QUOC DUC

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2643	

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _17 October 2001_ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _17 October 2001_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _2_ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
> in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
> patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
> international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
> subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1, 3-4, 7, 9-10, 12-13, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Nolting et al (6,385,301).

Consider claim 1, Nolting et al teach a process for analyzing telecommunication network

traffic (col. 4 lines 59-65) comprising the steps of: (a) accessing a call processing platform (col. 5

lines 4-6); (b) copying a call detail record for each call processed by said call processing

platform to a call detail database (col. 5 lines 4-6, lines 47 – col. 6 line 2); (c) periodically sorting

the call detail records by dialed number (col. 29 lines 3-29); (d) extracting a selected set of call

parameters from each call detail record (col. 5 lines 28-34; col. 6 lines 35-36); (e) aggregating

said selected set of call parameters for each dialed number for calls which occurred within a

selected interval (col. 5 lines 4-14, lines 28-40; col. 7 lines 49-63; col. 25 lines 11-35); (f) storing

the aggregated sets of call parameters within call parameter tables (col. 16 lines 43-58; col. 22

lines 38-46); and (g) analyzing said call parameter tables by dialed number to detect variations

over time of said call parameters (col. 8 lines 6-41).

Consider claim 3, Nolting et al suggested a process wherein said extracting step includes the step of: (a) extracting an hour of day during which each call to a dialed number occurred (col. 19 lines 18-36).

Consider claim 4, Nolting et al suggested a process wherein said extracting step includes the step of: (a) extracting a date on which each call to a dialed number occurred (col. 19 lines 18-36; col. 20 lines 27-36).

Consider claim 7, Nolting et al teach a process wherein said analyzing step includes the step of: (a) graphically plotting variations in a selected call parameter of a selected dialed number over time to detect said variations in said call parameter (col. 18 lines 1-7; col. 22 lines 65-67).

Conisder claim 9, Nolting et al teach a process including the steps of: (a) accessing a plurality of call processing platforms (col. 5 lines 4-6; col. 13 lines 23-51); (b) copying a call detail record of each call processed by each platform to said call detail database (col. 5 lines 4-6, lines 47 – col. 6 line 2; col. 13 lines 53-67); (c) sorting said call detail records by call processing platform (col. 29 lines 3-29); (d) aggregating said call parameters by dialed number and by call processing platform (col. 24 line 41 – col. 25 line 35); and (e) analyzing said call parameters by dialed number and by call processing platform (col. 25 lines 11-57).

Consider claim 10, Nolting et al teach a process for analyzing telecommunication network traffic (col. 4 lines 59-65) comprising the steps of: (a) accessing a plurality of call processing platforms (col. 5 lines 4-6; col. 13 lines 23-51); (b) copying a call detail record for each call processed by each call processing platform to a call detail database (col. 5 lines 4-6, lines 47 – col. 6 line 2; col. 13 lines 53-67); (c) periodically sorting the call detail records by

dialed number (col. 29 lines 3-29); (d) extracting a selected set of call parameters from each call

detail record (col. 5 lines 28-34; col. 6 lines 35-36); (e) aggregating said selected set of call

parameters for each dialed number for calls which occurred within each hour of each day (col. 7

lines 49-63; col. 19 lines 18-37; col. 25 lines 11-35); (f) storing the aggregated sets of call

parameters within call parameter tables (col. 16 lines 43-58; col. 22 lines 38-46); and (g)

analyzing said call parameter tables by dialed number to detect variations over time of said call

parameters (col. 8 lines 6-41).

Consider claim 12, Nolting et al suggested a process wherein said extracting step includes

the step of: (a) extracting an hour of day during which each call to a dialed number occurred (col.

19 lines 18-36).

Consider claim 13, Nolting et al suggested a process wherein said extracting step includes

the step of: (a) extracting a date on which each call to a dialed number occurred (col. 19 lines 18-

36; col. 20 lines 27-36).

Consider claim 16, Nolting et al teach a process wherein said analyzing step includes the

step of: (a) graphically plotting variations in a selected call parameter of a selected dialed

number over time to detect said variations in said call parameter (col. 18 lines 1-7).

Consider claim 18, Nolting et al teach a process including the steps of: (a) sorting said

call detail records by call processing platform (col. 29 lines 3-29); (b) aggregating said call

parameters by dialed number and by call processing platform (col. 24 line 41 – col. 25 line 35);

and (c) analyzing said call parameters by dialed number and by call processing platform (col. 25

lines 11-57).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 2, 5-6, 8, 11, 14-15, 17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Nolting et al (6,385,301) in view of Elliott et al (5,768,352).

        Consider claim 2, Nolting et al suggested the process of binning calls data by hour of day,

date, and call durations, etc. Nolting et al did not exclusively or clearly suggest a process

wherein said extracting step includes the step of: (a) extracting a duration of each call to each

dialed number. However, Elliott et al teach a system and method for generating detail statistical

data summary for a pre-selected telephone number (i.e., called number) from call detail records

wherein statistical data include call durations, total calls attempted and total calls completed (col.

2 lines 5-13; col. 3 lines 44-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Elliott et al into view

of Nolting et al in order to obtain a better view of communication traffic to a particular telephone

number thereby allow a more accurate network predictions and configurations.

        Consider claim 5, Nolting et al suggested the process of binning calls data by hour of day,

date, and call durations, etc. Nolting et al did not exclusively or clearly suggest a process

wherein said aggregating step includes the step of: (a) summing the total duration of all calls

made to each dialed number during each hour of each day. However, Elliott et al teach a system

and method for generating detail statistical data summary for a pre-selected telephone number

(i.e., called number) from call detail records wherein statistical data include call durations, total calls attempted and total calls completed (col. 2 lines 5-13; col. 3 lines 44-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Elliott et al into view of Nolting et al in order to obtain a better view of communication traffic to a particular telephone number thereby allow a more accurate network predictions and configurations.

Consider claim 6, Nolting et al suggested the process of binning calls data by hour of day, date, and call durations, etc. Nolting et al did not exclusively or clearly suggest a process wherein said aggregating step includes the step of: (a) summing the total number of calls made to each dialed number during each hour of each day. However, Elliott et al teach a system and method for generating detail statistical data summary for a pre-selected telephone number (i.e., called number) from call detail records wherein statistical data include call durations, total calls attempted and total calls completed (col. 2 lines 5-13; col. 3 lines 44-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Elliott et al into view of Nolting et al in order to obtain a better view of communication traffic to a particular telephone number thereby allow a more accurate network predictions and configurations.

Consider claim 8, Nolting et al suggested the process of binning calls data by hour of day, date, and call durations, etc. Nolting et al did not exclusively or clearly suggest a process wherein said analyzing step includes the step of: (a) detecting a maximum aggregated duration of calls to a dialed number within an hour for a selected day. However, Elliott et al teach a system and method for generating detail statistical data summary for a pre-selected telephone number

(i.e., called number) from call detail records wherein statistical data include call durations, total calls attempted and total calls completed (col. 2 lines 5-13; col. 3 lines 44-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Elliott et al into view of Nolting et al in order to obtain a better view of communication traffic to a particular telephone number thereby allow a more accurate network predictions and configurations.

Consider claim 11, Nolting et al suggested the process of binning calls data by hour of day, date, and call durations, etc. Nolting et al did not exclusively or clearly suggest a process wherein said extracting step includes the step of: (a) extracting a duration of each call to each dialed number. However, Elliott et al teach a system and method for generating detail statistical data summary for a pre-selected telephone number (i.e., called number) from call detail records wherein statistical data include call durations, total calls attempted and total calls completed (col. 2 lines 5-13; col. 3 lines 44-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Elliott et al into view of Nolting et al in order to obtain a better view of communication traffic to a particular telephone number thereby allow a more accurate network predictions and configurations.

Consider claim 14, Nolting et al suggested the process of binning calls data by hour of day, date, and call durations, etc. Nolting et al did not exclusively or clearly suggest a process wherein said aggregating step includes the step of: (a) summing the total duration of all calls made to each dialed number during each hour of each day. However, Elliott et al teach a system and method for generating detail statistical data summary for a pre-selected telephone number (i.e., called number) from call detail records wherein statistical data include call durations, total

calls attempted and total calls completed (col. 2 lines 5-13; col. 3 lines 44-62). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to utilize the teaching of Elliott et al into view of Nolting et al in order to obtain a better

view of communication traffic to a particular telephone number thereby allow a more accurate

network predictions and configurations.

Consider claim 15, Nolting et al suggested the process of binning calls data by hour of

day, date, and call durations, etc. Nolting et al did not exclusively or clearly suggest a process

wherein said aggregating step includes the step of: (a) summing the total number of calls made to

each dialed number during each hour of each day. However, Elliott et al teach a system and

method for generating detail statistical data summary for a pre-selected telephone number (i.e.,

called number) from call detail records wherein statistical data include call durations, total calls

attempted and total calls completed (col. 2 lines 5-13; col. 3 lines 44-62). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

utilize the teaching of Elliott et al into view of Nolting et al in order to obtain a better view of

communication traffic to a particular telephone number thereby allow a more accurate network

predictions and configurations.

Consider claim 17, Nolting et al suggested the process of binning calls data by hour of

day, date, and call durations, etc. Nolting et al did not exclusively or clearly suggest a process

wherein said analyzing step includes the step of: (a) detecting a maximum aggregated duration of

calls to a dialed number within an hour for a selected day. However, Elliott et al teach a system

and method for generating detail statistical data summary for a pre-selected telephone number

(i.e., called number) from call detail records wherein statistical data include call durations, total

calls attempted and total calls completed (col. 2 lines 5-13; col. 3 lines 44-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Elliott et al into view of Nolting et al in order to obtain a better view of communication traffic to a particular telephone number thereby allow a more accurate network predictions and configurations.

Consider claim 19, Nolting et al teach a process for analyzing telecommunication network traffic comprising the steps of: (a) accessing a plurality of call processing platforms (col. 5 lines 4-6; col. 13 lines 23-51); (b) copying a call detail record for each call processed by each call processing platform to a call detail database (col. 5 lines 4-6, lines 47 – col. 6 line 2; col. 13 lines 53-67); (c) periodically sorting the call detail records by dialed number (col. 29 lines 3-29); (d) extracting a selected set of call parameters from each call detail record including an hour of day during which each call to a dialed number occurred, and a date on which each call to a dialed number occurred (col. 5 lines 28-34; col. 6 lines 35-36; col. 19 lines 18-36; col. 20 lines 27-36); (e) aggregating said selected set of call parameters for each dialed number for calls which occurred within each hour of each day (col. 7 lines 49-63; col. 19 lines 18-37; col. 25 lines 11-35); (f) storing the aggregated sets of call parameters within call parameter tables (col. 16 lines 43-58; col. 22 lines 38-46); and (g) analyzing said call parameter tables by dialed number to detect variations over time of said call parameters (col. 8 lines 6-41) including: graphically plotting variations in a selected call parameter of a selected dialed number over time to detect said variations in said call parameter (col. 18 lines 1-7; col. 22 lines 65-67).

Nolting et al suggested the process of binning calls data by hour of day, date, and call durations, etc. Nolting et al did not exclusively or clearly suggest a process wherein said

extracting a selected set of call parameters from each call detail record including a duration of

each call to each dialed number; wherein aggregating including: (1) summing the total duration

of all calls made to each dialed number during each hour of each day, and (2) summing the total

number of calls made to each dialed number during each hour of each day; and wherein

analyzing including: detecting a maximum aggregated duration of calls to a dialed number

within an hour for a selected day. However, Elliott et al teach a system and method for

generating detail statistical data summary for a pre-selected telephone number (i.e., called

number) from call detail records wherein statistical data include call durations, total calls

attempted and total calls completed (col. 2 lines 5-13; col. 3 lines 44-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Elliott et al into view of Nolting et al in order to

obtain a better view of communication traffic to a particular telephone number thereby allow a

more accurate network predictions and configurations.

Consider claim 20, Nolting et al teach a process further including the steps of: (a) sorting

said call detail records by call processing platform (col. 29 lines 3-29); (b) aggregating said call

parameters by dialed number and by call processing platform (col. 24 line 41 – col. 25 line 35);

and (c) analyzing said call parameters by dialed number and by call processing platform (col. 25

lines 11-57).

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

6.   Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231
Facsimile responses should be faxed to:
(703) 872-9314
Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:
Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive
Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Quoc Tran** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5643**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Curtis Kuntz,** can be reached on **(703) 305-4708**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Technology Center 2600** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-0377**.

Quoc D. Tran
Patent Examiner AU 2643
July 9, 2003